



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,974	08/05/2003	Zhenming Wang	ACRYS.0101	6945
22858	7590	01/17/2006	EXAMINER	
CARSTENS & CAHOON, LLP P O BOX 802334 DALLAS, TX 75380			HANSEN, JAMES ORVILLE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3637	
DATE MAILED: 01/17/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/634,974	WANG, ZHENMING
	Examiner James O. Hansen	Art Unit 3637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-21 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-9, 13 and 15-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1,3,4,10-12 and 14 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn. Accordingly, new grounds of rejection are set forth as follows.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 10, 12 & 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Delatte [U.S. Patent No. 4,665,713]. Delatte (figures 1-3) teaches of a storage system comprising: a drawer (5) having a top surface (either a top surface of the bottom panel or a generic top surface [as in a surface above the bottom panel of the drawer] in as much as applicant defines a “top surface”; a frame (4) for accepting a drawer; and a top plate (6) for removably [element (6) is viewed as being removable, in the sense that the member is “placed in the ribs (14) of each of the drawers” {col. 2 – placement implying not permanently fixed} and the element is not shown in the depiction of the lower drawer in fig. 2] placing over the top surface of the drawer (fig. 1), wherein the top plate has at least one hole (15) for receiving a sample tube (2). The drawer having a face plate (12), the top plate being able to cover some or all of the top surface of the drawer (note figs. 1 & 3), and the drawer having a bottom plate (shown in fig. 2) capable of supporting bottles and/or tubes (fig. 1).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delatte in view of Wang [U.S. Patent No. 4,895,650]. Delatte teaches applicant's inventive claimed structure as disclosed above, but does not show a removable insert associated with the storage system. Wang (figures 1-4a) is cited as an evidence reference to show the known use of a removable insert (152a – removable in the sense that the insert is not integrally formed with the supporting structure and is not shown with the supporting structure in the embodiment as depicted in fig. 2) within a top plate having holes in a storage system. The system being used to support tubes. Accordingly, the position is taken that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the storage system of Delatte by incorporating a removable insert within the at least one hole as taught by Wang because this arrangement would provide Delatte with a means to securely hold the tubes within the apertured top plate enabling the tube to be firmly grasped thereby allowing the drawer to be tilted or inverted without the tubes sliding out of the drawer {note col. 2}.

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delatte in view of Woodruff [U.S. Patent No. 731,330]. Delatte teaches applicant's inventive claimed structure as disclosed above, but does not show the drawer as having a "card holder". Woodruff (figures 1-8) is cited as an evidence reference to show the known use of a card holder (H) on a faceplate of a drawer. Accordingly, the position is taken

that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the storage system of Delatte by incorporating a card holder on the drawer as taught by Woodruff because this arrangement would provide Delatte with a means to clearly identify the drawer itself or to identify contents associated with or located within the drawer as is conventionally known in the art.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments directed to the new grounds of rejection and filed on December 28, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is viewed that the prior art rejections substantially teach applicant's inventive claimed structure as presently set forth and adequately address the associated remarks.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James O. Hansen whose telephone number is 571-272-6866. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday between 8-4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on 571-272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



James O. Hansen  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3637

JOH  
January 9, 2006